



**MEETING MINUTES**

**HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD (HAB, Board)**

**River and Plateau Committee (RAP)**

*March 8, 2023*

*Hybrid Meeting – In-person and via Microsoft Teams*

<b>Topics in this Meeting Summary</b>	
Opening.....	2
Committee Leadership Election .....	2
324 Building Update.....	2
Committee Discussion with Regulators.....	5
Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2025 Cleanup Priorities .....	7
Open Forum .....	8
Committee Business .....	10
Meeting Recording .....	10
Attachments .....	10
Attendees .....	11

*This is only a summary of issues and actions discussed at this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of represented ideas or opinions, and it should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.*

## **Opening**

Mike Berkenbile, US Department of Energy (DOE) and DDFO, announced that the meeting was being held in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facilitator, welcomed meeting participants and notified the participants that the meeting was being recorded.

Tom Sicilia, Oregon Department of Energy and RAP Chair, reviewed the meeting agenda.

## ***Meeting Minute Approval***

The draft November meeting minutes were adopted without comment.

## ***Announcements***

Tom Sicilia explained that there was a new “RAP Sheet” included in the meeting packet. The RAP Sheet contained documents that could be of interest to the committee, each available in the Administrative Record.

Chris Sutton, Public at Large, suggested that the monthly unit manager meeting minutes, available in the Administrative Record, would be worth reviewing in addition to the items on the RAP Sheet.

Rob Davis, City of Pasco, noted that a [fact sheet was available for the “plug-in approach” for additional waste sites](#). He encouraged the committee to review that.

He felt that the approach was a significant accomplishment. He hoped to see more fact sheets of that sort in the future.

## **Committee Leadership Election**

Lacey Mansius, HAB Facilitation, reviewed nominations received prior to the meeting. Those included Tom Sicilia and Larry Haler, Public at Large, for chair. Larry Haler had also been nominated for vice chair.

Tom provided a statement. He explained that he had been the chair of the RAP for two years, though only had the opportunity to chair a small number of in-person meetings. Most of his time as chair was spent in online meetings. He was glad to see the committee members in person and appreciated the opportunity to hold conversations with people he had not previously met. He felt that good work was being done and good work would continue to be done. He was willing to put in the time to see that such work was done.

Larry explained that, though his name was put in for chair, he would prefer to continue serving as vice chair. Due to susceptibility to COVID-19, he preferred to continue attending meetings remotely.

Lacey invited questions from the committee. No questions were offered.

Tom Sicilia and Larry Haler were confirmed as chair and vice chair, respectively.

## **324 Building Update**

Tom Teynor, DOE, provided a briefing on the status of the 324 Building project, including challenges and findings encountered as the project progressed and the anticipated path forward. He stated that the project was a top priority for DOE.

He started with building stabilization efforts. In October of 2022, structural supports were completed beneath the B Cell where a sump had leaked and contaminated the soil. Micropiles were installed beneath the building to ensure it would remain stable as the soil beneath the building was excavated. He likened

the structure to a “building underneath a building.” The weight of the B Cell door presented a concern and was determined to require additional stabilization. Horizontal boreholes were being drilled beneath that door as part of the stabilization process.

He explained that for soil stabilization for Rooms 18 and 131, which were outside of the hot cell, vertical boreholes were being drilled to create a “screen” and prevent soil from slumping in as the hot cell soil was excavated. Acrylamide would be used for those boreholes, though they had not yet reached that point in the process.

Tom Teynor reviewed a picture that depicted micropile grouting in Room 18. He explained that the personal protective equipment (PPE) that the workers were wearing included full respirator hoods as a measure to protect the workers from dust. Next, he reviewed a photo of the airlock, explaining how the work would be performed in that space, such as waste staging and loading prior to disposal in the Environmental Restoration and Disposal Facility (ERDF).

During the horizontal borehole drilling, contamination was found underneath the building that had not been discovered during previous sampling efforts. There was a hotspot measured at 984 rads per hour and another at 776 rads per hour. Following that discovery, the team was continuing to prepare the hot cells, but was doing limited and focused drilling until the extent of condition was known.

Additionally, horizontal drilling was posing an unexpected challenge due to refusal and deflection as boulders were encountered. He stated that it was likely that a significant amount of fill was used in construction of the building initially, resulting in the high concentration of boulders. The crews continued to progress in that effort despite the challenges.

Drilling would be performed in multiple locations above and around the hotspot to gather data and determine how far the contamination reached. He emphasized that the contamination was all beneath the structure and was not detected by the surrounding monitoring wells. Should something be detected by those wells, the well network would be expanded.

He explained that the contamination was the result of a leak in a piping chase but would not speculate to its extent. The team would move forward cautiously until its extent was known to ensure the workers were not put at risk.

He stated that the project was still on schedule to meet the next related Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestone.

### *Regulatory Perspectives*

Anne McCartney, US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), explained that she oversaw the 300 Area scope for EPA. She appreciated the progress that continued to be made toward removal and the candid, open discussions that were being held on progress and challenges.

Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) representatives had nothing to add. It was stated that EPA served as lead regulator for the project; Ecology would support as needed.

### *Committee Discussion*

In regard to drilling challenges, Tom Sicilia asked if there was sufficient clearance to use a sonic drilling rig. Tom Teynor stated that he knew that the team was using modified drill bits to get through and had GPS capability to know when the drilling was being deflected off course. Additionally, the locations of micropiles were known and avoided. He stated that the team had not been asked to use sonic drilling.

Tom Sicilia asked if fire suppression system was still charged. Tom Teynor stated that it had been isolated following an earlier freeze and that the building was under fire watch when active work was being performed. All combustibles were being removed as a precaution.

Simone Anter, Columbia Riverkeeper, asked how deep the boreholes were. Tom Teynor stated that micropiles were drilled to the design depth of 31 feet and were completed in October. Soil stabilization borehole depth varied. The boreholes in Room 131 went down to approximately 25 feet, and those in Room 18 were approximately 15 feet deep.

Following, Simone asked for additional details about how the characterization efforts and the plans for that contaminated soil. Tom Teynor explained that samples were being taken on all sides of the discovered hotspots, above and below, to determine the extent of condition and the boundaries of the contamination. Additionally, the waste composition needed to be confirmed to determine the disposal location, as it would need to meet the associated waste acceptance criteria (WAC). The path forward would be determined based on what was found. He stated that it could result in a wider and deeper excavation that initially planned, if found to be a widespread issue. He offered to provide a follow-up presentation when more was known.

Esteban Ortiz, Public at Large, asked about worker safety in regard to the challenges encountered. Tom Teynor stated that, when the hot spots were found, work was paused, and the team went back to the radiation permit to ensure that proper PPE was in used. Water use was minimized to prevent contamination spread, and worker presence was minimized to reduce exposure. Worker safety remained the primary concern. Esteban asked how those measures impacted schedule and budget for the project. Tom Teynor explained that there was contingency built into the budget. Safety would remain paramount, even if the project took longer than initially planned as a result.

Tom Galioto, Tri-City Development Council (TRIDEC), asked if DOE felt it could meet the associated TPA milestone. Tom Teynor confirmed that the project was on track to meet the milestone. Tom Galioto asked if mapping would be done prior to excavation and when the extent of condition was expected to be known. Tom Teynor stated that the mapping would be done to fully understand the extent of condition. If the excavation needed to be wider than initially planned, the stabilization of the facility would need to be reassessed as well. He expected that the extent of condition would be known by the end of April, at the latest, accounting for challenges encountered related to weather and drilling.

Jan Catrell, Washington League of Women Voters, was interested in how the 324 Building mockup was being used in relation to the work being done. Tom Teynor explained that the facility was a full-scale mockup, which allowed the workers to be trained in a clean environment, using the same tools that would be used in the field. It offered the opportunity to proof work procedures and implement innovations offered by the workforce. It offered training, tool development, and issue resolution.

Tom Sicilia noted that he saw a social media post about the 324 Building project that depicted a large waste container being taken from the airlock. He asked if that was debris being removed from the hot cells.



"Crews with [@CPCCHanford](#) recently removed a large waste box from the 324 Building airlock for disposal at a landfill on the [@HanfordSite](#). The airlock provides a buffer to areas where workers are preparing to remove contaminated soil under the building."

Tom Teynor confirmed that it was and reviewed the photo of airlock training in his presentation to provide context. The goal of the effort being depicted was to determine if the waste would be suitable for disposal at ERDF.

Miya Burke, Hanford Challenge, asked what would occur if the contaminated soil did not meet the ERDF WAC. Tom Teynor stated that answer would still need to be determined and was the reason the project was progressing in a methodical manner.

Simone, noting that the hotspots were caused by leakage, asked if the source material had been characterized. Tom Teynor explained that the initial waste site was due to a spill of cesium and strontium. The newly discovered hotspots had the same isotopic characteristics; however, the source was presently unknown. The extent of condition surveys were being performed as a result of those unknown characteristics. Simone asked if there would be a public process associated with the characterization efforts. Tom Teynor was unfamiliar with the public notice process but agreed to look into it.

Tom Sicilia asked if, when the waste was characterized and classified against the ERDF WAC, DOE would perform an evaluation to ensure that waste was not high-level tank waste. Tom Teynor explained that the Yakama Nation sent a letter to EPA on the matter, and it was under evaluation by DOE. He was uncertain to the status of the evaluation but stated that a draft report had been generated as part of the response. The draft report would be sent to EPA first, as the agency that received the letter.

Tom Teynor expected that the next quarter of the year would be suitable timing for an update.

#### **Committee Discussion with Regulators**

Tom Sicilia explained that the discussion with the regulators was intended to serve as a check-in to see what items that the committee or Board may consider in the next 3 to 5 years. He understood that DOE did not have a subject matter expert present to provide input.

Ryan Miller, Ecology, stated that Ecology had two primary items of interest to review, one being a recent letter Ecology submitted on the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) and another on an upcoming Ecology comment period.

Edward Holbrook, Ecology, discussed a letter (23-NWP-026) that Ecology submitted as part of a WIPP public comment period. The public comment period was related to the New Mexico Environment Department's (NMED) proposed changes to the draft WIPP Permit, which would potentially result in early closure of the facility and impact the Hanford Site's ability to ship transuranic (TRU) waste offsite.

The letter discussed Ecology's position on the matter but did not discuss the conditions of the permit. The letter highlighted the inventory of TRU waste on the Hanford Site as identified in the M-091 milestone series and the associated timeline, which went out to the year 2050. The closure of WIPP at the end of the following its next 10-year permit renewal cycle was not in line with Hanford's milestones. Ecology hoped that NMED would consider that as it reviewed its permit.

No response to the letter had been received by that point, though that was expected as the comment period had closed only weeks prior to the committee meeting.

Tom noted that there was an Issue Manager (IM) team working on related draft advice.

Pam Larsen, Benton County, explained what she learned from her discussions with her local government counterparts in Carlsbad. She stated that there was a rumor going about that there was not enough land available for WIPP and that the Land Withdrawal Act would need to be revisited, however, Pam was advised that there was plenty of land available. What she found alarming was the statement that the

people at WIPP were skeptical that the Hanford Site would be ready to send waste when WIPP was ready to receive it. She suggested that the HAB could offer advice on that matter. Tom Sicilia noted that the idea had been suggested as part of the draft fiscal year (FY) 2025 cleanup priorities advice as well.

Dan Solitz, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, stated that he had seen mention that WIPP was at approximately 40% capacity. He suggested that it may not be a matter of land, but capacity in cubic meters. He felt that usage would be worth tracking.

Edward stated that was something that Ecology was tracking. Based on the known TRU waste inventory at Hanford and the capacity of WIPP, it was anticipated that WIPP could receive all of Hanford's TRU and TRU-mixed waste. Additionally, Ecology maintained regular dialogue with DOE on the matter and expected to be ready to ship waste to WIPP around 2028. Two documents were used to track that waste inventory: The Hanford Land Disposal Restrictions (LDR) Report and the *M-091 Transuranic Mixed and Mixed Low-Level Waste Project Management Plan*, which had been attached to Ecology's letter as supporting information.

Esteban Ortiz asked if Ecology had a plan to deal with unknowns. Edward clarified that the permit being renewed was presently in draft form. It was presently unknown if the draft conditions would make it into the permit as issued, or what might change in that permit when it was prepared for renewal a decade later. He stated, regarding unknowns with Hanford Site waste, that one of the main priorities was ensuring that the rest of the retrievably stored waste on the Hanford Site, such as the waste in trenches, was out of the ground and into safe storage so it could be prepared for shipment to WIPP. It was expected that WIPP had the capacity for the remainder of the retrievably stored waste.

Rose Ferri, Yakama Nation, asked about the timeline for shipping waste. Tom Sicilia clarified that, under the M-091 milestone series, that shipments would start in 2028.

Pam asked if the Central Waste Complex (CWC)-certified containers were ready to be shipped or if they would require recertification due to time past. Edward stated that it would be up to the teams at Hanford and WIPP to determine if recertification was necessary to adapt to any new criteria. Pam also asked about waste that needed to be transferred to certified containers. Edward confirmed that there was approximately 5,000 cubic meters of waste within the CWC that needed to be repackaged in WIPP-certified containers.

Tom Sicilia stated that the committee appreciated Ecology's engagement on the national level to ensure the Hanford mission was completed.

Roberto Armijo, EPA, provided highlights of EPA's recent activities. With the 100-BC Area, EPA had an extension on its review of remedial design/remedial action (RDRA) review as it worked with DOE and the Yakama Nation to resolve some cultural matters. The present extension was to March 31 and another extension was expected. At 100-K, a remedial investigation/feasibility study (RI/FS) was being developed in cooperation with DOE. He planned to update the HAB on the date for the proposed plan when available.

Additionally, as previously discussed, EPA was working with DOE on the 324 Building project. Related Central Plateau milestones were on track to be met.

Rose Ferri provided additional detail to Roberto's comment on the 100-BC extension. She explained that the Yakama Nation was working to DOE to resolve the issues that were delaying the project, but due to the timing and intersection with cultural resource regulations, an additional extension would likely be

required. Potential delays for the 100-K and 100-N areas were anticipated as well. She clarified that the delays were a result of cultural resource regulatory timelines.

Tom Sicilia asked about efforts to minimize clean fill going into ERDF. Anne McCartney explained that the effort was going well and that the plug-in approach was recently used to identify additional contaminated soil to the mix and balance other debris. EPA would continue to monitor DOE's long-term planning for that balance.

Chris Sutton noted that the caissons at 618-11 contained an unknown amount of TRU and lacked adequate records of their content. He asked if those were scheduled for WIPP or if there was another disposal pathway for them. Edward stated that the M-091 Project Management Plan discussed the known inventories of waste and such unknowns. He expected that when cleanup actions were approved there would be characterization and inventories and TRU mixed waste may be identified. The disposal pathway was presently unknown.

Rob Davis asked for an overview of the permitting process. As a brief overview, Edward explained the permitting process, as it related to the comment period. At the end of a 10-year cycle the WIPP dangerous waste permit expired and needed to be renewed. That timeline for the revision and renewal processes was built into the overall 10-year cycle for the permit. He explained that WIPP and Hanford's dangerous waste permit renewals were not linked to one another.

Ryan noted that Ecology had a comment period for the Solid Waste Operations Complex (SWOC) starting the following week. Edward explained that in December of 2021, Ecology issued a letter to permit seven closure unit groups at SWOC. The modification to the closure plans was appealed by DOE. As part of the resulting settlement, Ecology agreed to modify five of closure plans and the Unit-Specific Permit Conditions that applied to each of the seven closure units.

Jeff Wyatt, Oregon Hanford Cleanup Board, asked for a high-level overview of the changes. Edward stated that those included changes to sampling locations, decontamination of concrete pads, and a timeline change for DOE's notification to Ecology where deviations from the closure plan occur from 24 hours to four business days.

Tom Sicilia asked if the Site-Wide Permit was still on track for January 24. Ryan confirmed that was still on track, as last he heard. He planned go to the Public Involvement and Communications Committee (PIC) with the plans for the associated public comment period.

#### **Draft Advice on Fiscal Year 2025 Cleanup Priorities**

Chris Sutton introduced the draft advice. He explained that the basis of the advice was the Hanford 5-Year Plan, as that document concentrated on projects that were a priority to be accomplished. The advice categorized projects in the same manner, separating priorities by Tank Waste, Risk Reduction, and Infrastructure. Within those categories, items were not ranked by priorities. He noted that the priorities were largely in alignment with those stated by DOE in a recent cleanup priorities public meeting. He noted that if any of the FY24 projects as identified in the Hanford 5-Year Plan were not completed as scheduled, those would become top priorities for FY25.

Chris reviewed the contents of the draft advice. Committee members offered input as he reviewed each item.

He noted that the item on supplemental low-activity waste was a subject of discussion in the Tank Waste Committee (TWC). Though initially worded around shipment of TRU waste, the item had since been revised to ask DOE to communicate the plan for the Test Bed Initiative (TBI). However, during the

cleanup priorities public meeting, it was learned that TBI was funded and underway. The committee discussed the idea of deleting the item as the effort could be advanced sooner than FY25 versus keeping it to communicate that it remained a Board priority. The path forward for that item would be determined by the associated IM team.

Following review of each advice item, Gary Younger provided comments for committee consideration about the advice actionability. The prior year's advice on FY24 cleanup priorities was not seen as actionably by DOE as the suggested accelerations in schedule added approximately \$4 billion in costs. The Hanford 5-Year Plan, he stated, closely followed DOE's expectation for flat funding. He clarified that he did not want to influence the advice but cautioned that suggesting too many accelerations could cause the advice not to be seen as actionable. Chris explained that the draft advice narrative, which was not shown at that time, clarified the intention of identified accelerations was for instances where additional funding might be available.

Gary recalled the "virtuous circle" concept that Brian Vance often referred to during his updates to the Board. He stated that DOE hoped for the HAB to consider a commitment to turn around to their stakeholder groups to garner funding support. DOE, and other federal government agencies, were unable to lobby for funding from the federal government. However, the previous year, several stakeholder organizations banded together to write letters to request additional funding for the Hanford Site. Tom Sicilia clarified that it would need to be clear that such letters would not be written on behalf of the HAB, but from the stakeholder groups individually. Gary expected that any letters written would be appreciated.

### **Open Forum**

Tom Sicilia explained that open forum was a space to talk about anything the committee wanted to discuss, related to the RAP or Hanford overall.

Rob Davis was interested in the adaptive milestone approach and how the schedule was tracked with that approach being used. Tom Sicilia explained that the adaptive milestone approach did not have a "moving" three-year window. Instead, milestones were decided for the following years. Rob asked how that would be budgeted. Tom stated that aspect was being asked as part of the related public comment period. He trusted that the TPA agencies could work through that aspect to ensure the milestones were achievable.

Tom noted that a new Hanford 5-Year Plan was expected in October and would likely outline new milestones. Gary Younger confirmed the expectation that updates throughout the 5-year window were expected to be reflected in the 5-year plan. Tom noted that he was interested in how the 5-year plan and the adaptative milestones would "comingle."

Chris Sutton noted that the adaptive milestones were shown as having started in the *2022 Hanford Lifecycle, Scope, Schedule and Cost Report*. He thought it would be interesting to see how those advanced in the 2025 report.

Tom considered the idea of generating a timeline or look-ahead that listed upcoming reviews, reports, and similar items of interest. Ryan Miller agreed to check if something like that existed for management.

Jan Catrell noted changes in the 5-Year Plan "placemat" format. Gary confirmed that there were changes made. It now focused on "goals" for presently unfunded projects, rather than expectations.

Rob discussed challenges created by the length of the mission. Due to its length, normal project management tools could not be effectively applied. Often times, milestones were not able to be achieved, and he expected that the adaptive milestone approach was likely to improve that success rate, as they could be adjusted for the near term where the agencies had more knowledge and control of the related



circumstances. Tom and Chris agreed. It was expected that looking ahead was a necessary practice but became more speculative the further out it went.

Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge, contributed a [list](#) that Hanford Challenge (HC) put together on the milestones in abeyance as part of the Adaptive Milestone Approach. She noted that there was also a related end state contracting model associated with this Adaptive Milestone Change Package comment period and hoped to see and update on the tool that was being developed to “better predict” realistic milestones.

Additionally, Liz posted a summary that might be helpful from an email HC put together during the comment period:

“As we understand it, a company that worked at Sellafield—a contaminated site in the UK—was hired to create a computer model to set deadlines. This model used variables like available equipment, personnel, and cleanup budget to set realistic target dates for completing the work.

That contractor, Different by Design, is now in the process of building the computer deadline model for Hanford, but it isn't done yet. We think the public should get a chance to comment on the model, its inputs, and success metrics.

The Tri-Party Agencies agreed for 14 milestones to go into abeyance, meaning the deadlines were missed, and they agreed to wait to put in new dates UNTIL the model is done. USDOE broke some of the work into smaller pieces, which created new interim milestones to continue cleanup.

So we've got 14 milestones sitting off to the side until a computer model spits out new deadlines.

In an attempt to resolve endless delays, USDOE is piloting the Adaptive Milestone Approach, which uses the computer model, adds a 3-year batched deadline plan, and breaks some of the milestones/deadlines into smaller pieces of work. Negotiation for the next batch (2024-2027) will start in 2023. The Adaptive Milestone Approach is also meant to integrate with the new [End State Contracting Model](#).”

Ryan Miller provided the [responsiveness summary](#) from the 2022 comment period.

Tom suggested that there was potential for an update on the adaptive milestone approach to the Board in April. Alternatively, the RAP could request the topic as part of its work plan for the following year.

Jeff Wyatt noted that he had heard little about contracts and wondered if there was anything that the committee should or needed to know about them in regard to Hanford. Chris explained that the Budgets and Contracts Committee (BCC) previously requested a presentation on the end states contracting model presently in use for the Hanford Site. Tom noted that that the BCC used to get a “heads up” on contract releases and the opportunity to offer an informal opinion, but that was no longer the case.

Pam Larsen stated that those contracts had been in place for a few years at that point, and there was no opportunity for advice. However, she was interested to learn how well the model had been working. Tom suggested that a one-hour webinar may be appropriate, perhaps outside of a HAB meeting. He stated that could serve as outreach and education not only for the HAB, but for the public as well. Chris recalled that a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report suggested that it was now working as well as DOE hoped.

Jeff asked about high-level waste (HLW) outside of the waste tanks. Tom explained that there were a number of wastes that, if looked at differently, could be considered to be HLW such as the German logs.

He stated that the subject was discussed in the past, however, as those wastes had no disposal path, the subject was not “ripe” yet.

Tom asked if there were any items of interest to the RAP on a national level. Pam suggested that the Hanford panel at the recent Waste Management summit may be of interest.

Rob recalled work being done in the riparian zone in the 100-N Area and wondered if that was successful. Tom recalled that, during the most recent briefing on the matter, a proposed plan for the final Record of Decision (ROD) was expected. Installation of the apatite barriers was halted until that final ROD was available, which would contain additional locations for installation. He explained that the apatite barriers were permeable reactive barriers designed to capture strontium-90, designed to mimic the way radionuclide would be absorbed into a bone. From what he had seen, the method was about 90% effective on first pass, but required a second “polishing” barrier or additional remediation method. The final ROD was expected to detail those next steps.

Rose Ferri explained that Yakama Nation was in cultural and technical conversations with the TPA agencies related to the apatite barrier on effectiveness and potential impacts of its use. The Yakama Nation identified issues that needed to be resolved and had many unresolved issues and concerns. She noted that 100-N was an extremely culturally sensitive area. She stated that after those were resolved, Yakama Nation may be able to discuss the topic with the RAP.

Chris noted that a significant diesel fuel spill occurred in the 100-N Area in the past, noting that it was interesting in how it was different from other types of contamination at Hanford. Tom recalled that in order to top floating fuel from reaching the river a trench was dug to gather the fuel, which was burned on a weekly basis as a mass removal method. Bioventing was done as a polishing step, which he believed was successful.

### **Committee Business**

The Waste Encapsulation and Storage Facility (WESF) and a 100-K Area update were identified as topics for RAP’s next meeting in June. It was requested that the 100-K Area update include a short update on the progress of the 324 Building project based on what was learned earlier in the meeting. It was expected that the RAP could dedicate time to discussing its work plan for FY24. Should it be ready for review, the committee could consider draft advice related to TRU waste.

A larger 324 Building update was considered for later in the year.

### ***Future Topics and Work Plan Input***

Topics of interest identified for the future included:

- 100-N Area
- 618-11
- Decisions or plans on per- and polyfluoroalkyl substance (PFAS) remediation

### **Meeting Recording**

[https://youtu.be/MU\\_eCWS4fg](https://youtu.be/MU_eCWS4fg)

### **Attachments**

[Attachment 1: Meeting Agenda](#)

[Attachment 2: Draft November RAP Meeting Minutes](#)

[Attachment 3: March RAP Sheet](#)

[Attachment 4: DOE Presentation 324 Building Update](#)

[Attachment 5: Cleanup Priorities Draft Advice Excerpt](#)

Attendees

**Board Members and Alternates:**

Chris Sutton, Primary*	Esteban Ortiz, Primary*	Jan Catrell, Primary*
Jeff Wyatt, Primary*	Larry Halder, Primary	Laurene Contreras, Primary
Miya Burke, Primary*	Rob David, Primary*	Susan Coleman, Primary*
Tom Galioto, Primary*	Dan Solitz, Alternate	Pam Larsen, Alternate*
Rose Ferri, Alternate	Simone Anter, Alternate	Tom Sicilia, Alternate*

**Others:**

Gary Younger, DOE*	Edward Holbrook, Ecology	Dieter Bohrmann, CPCCo
Mike Berkenbile, DOE	George Peck, Ecology	Patrick Conrad, HMIS
Tom Teynor, DOE*	Ryan Miller, Ecology*	Dana Gribble, HMIS
	Anne McCartney, EPA	Matt Hendrickson, ODOE
	Roberto Armijo, EPA	Li Wang, YN ERWM
	Tom Rogers, WADOH*	Liz Mattson, Hanford Challenge
		Ahtziry Medina
		Jessica
		Sally Smith
		Josh Patnaude, HAB Facil.*
		Lacey Mansius, HAB Facil.*
		Ruth Nicholson, HAB Facil.*

*\*Indicates that the individual was signed in or otherwise noted as an in-person attendant*

**Note:** Participants for this virtual meeting were asked to sign in with their name and affiliation in the chat box of Microsoft Teams. Not all attendees shared this information. The attendance list reflects what information was collected at the meeting.